DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 928 SO 011 304

AUTHOR Lachman, Seymour P., Ed.
TITLE Fourth Annual Conference on Public and Non-Public Schools: Value Education. December 1, 1977. Proceedings.
INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Center for Advanced Study in Education.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 69p.; Table 1 on page 12 may not reproduce clearly due to poor legibility

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affective Objectives; Cognitive Objectives; Conference Reports; Curriculum Development; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Needs; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Practice; Educational Responsibility; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Moral Values; *Private Schools; Religious Education; Religious Factors; Teacher Education; *Values

ABSTRACT

Convened to offer a forum for discussion of values education to over 100 representatives of public and private schools, the conference explored moral dilemmas, educational trends, cognitive moral development, and educational objectives. The keynote address by values education exponent Dr. Edwin Fenton (Director, Carnegie-Mellon Education Center, Pittsburgh) characterized the variety of values education programs which have proliferated in public and private schools in the United States since the 1950s. Examples of types of programs include values analysis, values clarification, hidden curriculum changes, and programs based on cognitive moral development concepts. Fenton also identified key issues related to values education in the schools, including the relationship between the school and the home, the role of the general public in setting educational guidelines, and moral education and the educational community. Other conference sessions dealt with goal setting, in-service programs in values education, moral development theory, and responsibility education. A directory of conference participants concludes the document. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

- ED162928

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Seymour P. Lachman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Proceedings

Fourth Annual Conference on Public and Non-Public Schools: Value Education

December 1, 1977

SP 011 304

Edited by
Seymour P. Lachman

Center for Advanced Study in Education
The Graduate School and University Center
of the City University of New York

CASE 19-78
1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION		1
KEYNOTE ADDRESS: AN OVERVIEW	Edwin Fenton	3
PART I - FOUR APPROACHES TO VALUE EDUCATION		3
PART II - TAKING PART IN A VALUE DISCUSSION		15
LUNCHEON SESSION		
OPENING REMARKS	Morris Sherer	25
TRIBUTES TO THE LATE REV. JAMES A. FEENEY	Vincent Breen	27
	Seymour P. Lachman	30
ADDRESS	Theodore M. Black	32
AFTERNOON SESSION		
WORKSHOP ON DEVELOPING PRACTICAL PROGRAMS IN VALUE EDUCATION	Ralph Brande, Joseph Preill	34
CONCLUDING SESSION	Vincent Breen	43
APPENDICES		
A Roster of Conference Participants		53
B Conference Program		61
C Conference Planning Committee		65
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY - SOURCES FOR MORAL DILEMMAS	Edwin Fenton	67

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FOURTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON PUBLIC AND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS: VALUE EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

The Fourth Annual Conference on Public and Non-Public Schools took place on December 1, 1977. These annual conferences, under the Chairmanship of Seymour P. Lachman, are co-sponsored by the Graduate School and University Center and Baruch College of the City University of New York. They bring together the leaders of the public and non-public schools to discuss matters of mutual concern. Among the participants were the representatives of the following organizations:

Agudath Israel of America
Catholic Schools of the Archdiocese of New York
Catholic Schools of the Diocese of Brooklyn
Citizens Committee for Children
Council of Supervisory Associations
Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York
National Hebrew Day School Movement
Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod Schools
New York City Board of Education
New York City School Boards Association
Public Education Association
United Federation of Teachers
United Parents Associations
Representatives from various private non-sectarian schools

The Planning Committee, representing the above groups, decided that the theme for the Fourth Annual Conference on Public and Non-Public Schools should be Value Education, a topic of major interest to all school systems. It was the first time that over 100 official representatives of these different school systems met to discuss value education.

Dr. Edwin Fenton, Director of the Carnegie-Mellon Education Center in Pittsburgh and one of the nation's leading exponents of value education, was invited to be the keynote speaker and the Honorable Theodore M. Black, Cancellor, New York State Board of Regents, was our luncheon speaker.

These proceedings are a record of what took place at the conference. The results will be recorded in new curricula, new seminars and, ultimately, in the classroom.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS--AN OVERVIEW

Edwin Fenton, Director
Carnegie-Mellon Educational
Center, Pittsburgh

PART I

FOUR APPROACHES TO VALUE EDUCATION

Since the end of World War II, and particularly in the last ten years, values education programs have proliferated in American schools. They come in great variety. Some of them, such as the Magic Circle, stress students' feelings. Others such as Lawrence Kohlberg's work in cognitive moral development, stress how people think about moral or value issues. Still others, such as values clarification, emphasize both feeling and thought. The educational techniques that values educators endorse also vary widely. Some values programs recommend that teachers accept what students say--accept their judgments, accept their feelings, accept their opinions--without challenging them. Others are based on cognitive dissonance and contend that a teacher's function is to challenge consistently in order to set up conflicts in students' minds.

Values programs also vary greatly in the degree of change that they ask in a school system. Some ask only that teachers incorporate a few value discussions a year into courses such as English or Social Studies. Others suggest that schools organize separate courses in values. Still others argue that we must reorganize an entire school system in order to get at the latent or hidden curriculum, the source

of so much value learning in the schools. They also differ in the grade levels which are involved. The Magic Circle is confined primarily to elementary schools. Other programs stretch throughout elementary and secondary schools.

In this first session, I'm going to talk about four values education programs which have implications for both elementary and secondary school education. I thought it might be better to concentrate on programs that would be of interest to all of you, rather than select some that would interest only elementary school people or people whose focus is on secondary school education.

Let me begin with values analysis. The term values analysis refers to a large number of programs of values education that focus on the analysis of values in real life situations. Many of these real life situations are historical. Most of them start with an incident presented as a dilemma, such as in this example advocated by Jack R. Fraenkel. He asks this question: Should Susan B. Anthony have stopped working for feminism in order to devote her time and energy to the Union cause during the Civil War? The analysis then focuses on a number of issues. Here are the kinds of guidelines presented. First, clarify the nature of the particular value conflict in which Susan B. Anthony found herself. Secondly, ask for the facts and make sure that students understand the circumstances accurately. Thirdly, ask for alternatives. Given the situation and these facts and circumstances, what are the alternative courses of action? Fourthly, think about the consequences of embracing each alternative, and trace the consequences through intellectually. Next, ask for evidence to support the likelihood

of each of these alternatives occurring. Is alternative A likely and is it really going to have an effect? Finally, ask for a judgment about which alternative seems best.

Most values analysis focuses around teacher-led discussion. These are sophisticated questions. The technique requires a discussion in which the teacher leads and plays a vital role. Since most values analysis takes place largely in traditional social studies classes, it places new demands on teachers.

Critics have advanced four major criticisms of values analysis. First, they point out that it requires full formal operational thought on the Piagetian scale--thinking of all alternatives, deducing the logical consequences, gathering data, and so forth. Only about half of American adults function at full formal operational thought; clearly, many students can't handle it. Secondly, they argue that values analysis ignores research about developmental stages of thought about civic and moral issues, a subject to which I will turn in a moment. Students who think at Stage 2 on the Kohlberg scale are going to respond at Stage 2 in this sort of values analysis. Thirdly--a criticism that applies to all of these techniques--many students are bored by values analysis, particularly if teachers use it repeatedly. Many students become bored because they can't utilize the complex, sophisticated formal thought processes that this technique demands. Finally, critics argue that little research has been done to relate what happens in the classroom to what takes place in real life.

Let us now turn to values clarification, a process with which all of you are probably familiar. It refers to a great variety of classroom techniques which utilize one or more steps of a seven-step process by which, according to its advocates, people arrive at values. These steps are:

Choosing: (1) freely
(2) from alternatives
(3) after thoughtful consideration of the consequences of each alternative

Prizing: (4) cherishing, being happy with the choice
(5) willing to affirm the choice publicly

Acting: (6) doing something with the choice
(7) repeatedly, in some pattern of life

The advocates of values clarification have provided a remarkable variety of classroom activities, and they have published them in numerous books. Most of these techniques involve some form of full class participation which is activity oriented, and many of these activities are student focused, rather than teacher focused. Most students find them quite exciting and interesting to do although, like any technique, they can become boring if used to excess. This criticism can be made of all the techniques I am going to talk about.

Now, for criticisms of values clarification. Four strike me as particularly important. First, the claim that a person can develop a value only by going through the seven-step process is sociological nonsense. It implies that people in a traditional society have no values because they have not examined and weighed alternative value positions. Secondly, it implies that all values arrived at through the seven-step process are of equal worth. Values clarification provides

no way to resolve a values conflict. If two people who go through the seven steps develop entirely different values positions on an issue, there is no way within the scheme to determine which is the better. Values clarification is a system of ethical relativity, a philosophical position which many people oppose. Thirdly, there is only sparse research evidence to support the claims that many proponents of values education make. Several pieces of careful research have shown no significant results stemming from the use of these techniques. Finally, some critics claim that values clarification at its best is really a form of Rogerian client center therapy. Perhaps people such as Sidney Simon should attempt to develop a rationale based on Rogerian therapy and abandon the seven-step process. They ought to try to differentiate the moral issues in values clarification from some of the issues that involve personal values and problems.

A third kind of value program attempts to democratize schools by changing the hidden curriculum. All of us should distinguish between the manifest and the latent, or the formal and hidden curricula. The manifest or formal curriculum takes place within courses designed to reach specific sets of goals. The hidden or latent curriculum consists of all those activities in school from which students learn but which are not part of the formal courses. The way one organizes a class carries a powerful latent curriculum message; indeed, my lecture today has a latent message. I am presented to you as an expert on a topic. Your function is to take notes and to absorb what you can, and perhaps to ask some questions. The physical setup has established teacher

space and student space, implying that the speaker is an authority rather than a co-learner.

How one organizes and administers a school also carries a clear latent curriculum message. Most students in schools perceive schools as Stage 1 and Stage 2 institutions of the Kohlberg scale. If you ask them, "Hey, man, they take you down to the office, the principal calls your parents, and they both beat on you. And then you know how wrong you are." It's classic Stage 1 on the Kohlberg scale. If you ask, "Does that happen to everybody?" they often say, "Nah, you know, if you're a football player or you're really straight, then they kind of let you off. But if you've been in a lot of trouble in the past, look out." That's Stage 2 on the Kohlberg scale: if you've been nice to the principal and the teacher, then the principal and the teacher are going to be nice to you. Many students perceive schools as Stage 1 and Stage 2 institutions, and that tells them something about values. That tells them that all people are not created equal, and it delivers this powerful message so strongly that it sinks deeply into students' consciousness.

There have been many programs, often starting in the middle 1960s, to organize alternative forms of education in order to deliver different latent curriculum messages. William Glasser's attempts to organize democratic classrooms in elementary schools may stand as an example. Glasser has developed systems of self-government in microcosm within an elementary school classroom. Here, students begin to think that they have some power and that there are rules which apply equally to everyone. They come to believe that they have a voice in making

those rules, and that the rules are fair. That's a very different curriculum message. The work of Lawrence Kohlberg at Harvard University, and of his colleagues in other places around the country, give a similar message. The project that my colleagues and I at Carnegie-Mellon University have been organizing echoes this approach. We've set up small communities of 50 to 60 students within a school. They take English and social studies together, and have three additional periods a week, which we call community activity periods, where they work on community building exercises and a participatory structure.

As a basis of our governmental structure, we have all agreed, students and staff alike, to obey national, state, and local law, as well as school board regulations. But the school board has given us permission to develop our own sanctions. When people break school rules, we decide what sanctions to enforce rather than have the sanctions of the wider school apply. Students see this situation very differently from the usual school governance. They think it is fairer, and they learn to take responsibility for their actions.

This approach generates a new climate in the school and delivers a powerful latent curriculum message. Programs like this have been going on in alternative schools for a number of years and should now be implemented in other schools as well. The major point is that a significant organized form of values education comes about through reorganizing the structure of schools. It need not be the structure of a whole school. It can be the structure of a single classroom within the school, but even this limited change can deliver a powerful values lesson to students.

Critics point to a number of problems with this approach to values education. The most important issue focuses on the institutional resistance to the widespread changes in school administration and governance which this approach implies. Our large secondary schools with thousands of students and hundreds of staff members change slowly, and democratizing them is an enormous job. Secondly, we have little valid research to support the claimr of the proponents of democratic education. Thirdly, few tested techniques for change in this direction are available for the educational community to study and adopt. Finally, the public schools which have moved in this direction have done so largely within alternative programs, leaving the wider school setting untouched.

Finally, let me turn to cognitive moral development, the topic on which I would like to spend most of our morning. As the words imply, it refers to ways in which people's thinking about moral or civic problems develops. I don't like the term moral education because it has misleading connotations for many people. When many people hear the term moral education, they think teachers are going to tell students how to behave under a variety of circumstances. That's not what cognitive moral development is about. Instead it focuses on how people think about ethical and civic problems, all of which are moral problems. If you have loyalty to a friend in conflict with authority, which is more important? That's a vital civic issue. Do you turn a friend in for shoplifting? Shoplifting's against the law, but a friend's a friend. That's also a really vital civic issue.

I believe that if we talk about the development of stages of

civic understanding, particularly in public schools, we're on much more accurate, and therefore safer, ground. We're not so likely to provoke opposition from people who object to the idea that schools may be trying to inculcate a specific set of religious or ethical values in their students. That's not what cognitive moral development is about anyway.

We're going to examine a filmstrip about cognitive moral development in a few minutes, so I will not go into a theoretical discussion of this approach now. However, it is important to know what the approach says about ways to think of civic issues. Kohlberg says that there are six stages of moral or civic thought, but very few people think at Stage 6. For practical pedagogical purposes, therefore, there are five ways in which people think about ethical, moral, or civic issues organized in three levels. Table I indicates these levels and stages of thought. (See page 12.)

Several research findings about the stages of thought are particularly vital to understand. First, people move through the stages in invariant sequence, although many people become fixated at an early stage. Although we have no national samples, we believe that less than half of American adults reason at Stages 4 or 5. Secondly, encountering and dealing with either real or hypothetical moral dilemmas produces cognitive conflict and, over a period of years, results in stage change since higher stages of moral thought solve ethical problems better than they can be solved at lower stages. Thirdly, people are able to generate moral arguments at their own stage but not at higher ones, and they are able to comprehend

TABLE I

Levels of Stages of Ethical, Moral, and Civic Thought

The Preconventional Level
(Stages 1 and 2)

At this level, people consider the power of authority figures or the physical or hedonistic consequences of actions, such as punishment, reward, or exchange of favors. This level has the following two stages:

Stage 1: The Punishment and Obedience Orientation

At this stage, the physical consequences of doing something determine whether it is good or bad without regard for its human meaning or value. People at Stage 1 think about avoiding punishment or earning rewards, and they defer to authority figures with power over them.

Stage 2: The Instrumental Relativist Orientation

At Stage 2 right reasoning leads to action which satisfies one's own needs and sometimes meets the needs of others. Stage 2 thought often involves elements of fairness, but always for pragmatic reasons rather than from a sense of justice or loyalty. Reciprocity, a key element in Stage 2 thought, is a matter of "you scratch my back and I'll scratch yours."

The Conventional Level
(Stages 3 and 4)

People at this level value maintaining the expectations of their family, group, or nation for its own sake and regardless of its immediate consequences. People at the conventional level show loyalty to the social order and actively maintain, support, and justify it. This level has the following two stages:

Stage 3: The Interpersonal Sharing Orientation

At this stage, people equate good behavior with whatever pleases or helps others and with what others approve of. Stage 3 people often conform to stereotypical ideas of how the majority of people in their group behave. They often judge behavior by intentions, and they earn approval by being "nice."

Stage 4: The Societal Maintenance Orientation

Stage 4 thought orients toward authority, fixed rules, and the maintenance of the social order. Right behavior consists of doing one's duty, showing respect for authority, or maintaining the given social order for its own sake.

The Principled Level
(Stages 5 and 6)

At this level, people reason according to moral principles which have validity apart from the authority of groups to which the individuals belong. This level has the following two stages:

Stage 5: The Social Contract, Human Rights and Welfare Orientation

People at Stage 5 tend to define right action in terms of general individual rights and standards which have been examined critically and agreed upon by the entire society. Stage 5 people stress the legal point of view, but they emphasize the possibility of changing laws after rational consideration of the welfare of the society. Free agreement and contract bind people together where no laws apply.

Stage 6: The Universal Ethical Principle Orientation

At Stage 6, people define the right by the decision of their conscience guided by self-chosen ethical principles such as justice, equality, or the dignity of the individual. These principles appeal to logical comprehensiveness, universality, and consistency. Instead of being concrete rules, such as the Ten Commandments, they are abstract ethical principles, such as the categorical imperative.

arguments only at their own stage or at one stage higher than their own. The arguments of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are based on principles inherent in Stage 5. Stage 4 thinkers do not generate these arguments, and many Stage 4 and all Stage 3 thinkers cannot comprehend them, that is, they cannot successfully paraphrase a Stage 5 argument. For this reason, the best thought of sophisticated political science, all of moral philosophy, the most vital of the world's religious ideas, and the plots of much of humankind's best literature are beyond the grasp of more than half of American adults. That is the main reason why programs of moral discussion should play a vital part in American education in an attempt to foster the ability to think at sophisticated cognitive moral stages in order to open students to the richness of our humanistic heritage.

Let me indicate four problems that some critics raise with this approach to values education. First, moral discussions can be repetitious and will bore students if they're used to excess, especially if they are organized in the same way every time. We have to think of a great variety of ways to present issues. Secondly, critics point out that some scholars do not accept the universality of the stages. Professor Kohlberg and his colleagues have, however, done research in nine societies, and they find the same stages of thought in all these societies, except that there are no Stage 5 and Stage 6 thinkers in the traditional societies. Thirdly, critics point to how difficult it is to train typical classroom teachers who are unfamiliar with cognitive developmental psychology, who don't know much about

Kohlberg's work, and who are not born discussion leaders to conduct moral discussions.

This morning we would like to introduce you to cognitive moral development. To do so, we'd like all of you to participate in a moral discussion. In a few minutes, we will show you a sound filmstrip that comes from a kit that Linda Rosenzweig, Lawrence Kohlberg, and I prepared for Guidance Associates. This kit is designed for a six-hour teacher preparation workshop. The moral dilemma we will discuss is entitled "Mr. Peterson's Dilemma." It is a dilemma about whether Mr. Peterson ought to tell school authorities about an impending student boycott of the school cafeteria. When I've used this same dilemma with typical classroom teachers, they usually divide roughly fifty-fifty about the correct course to take in this situation where different societal norms and values are involved on each side of the issue. So let us get the details of Mr. Peterson's Dilemma, and then let's discuss it.

PART II

VALUE EDUCATION IN THE SCHOOLS:

THE KEY ISSUES

Let us now think about the affected constituencies in the whole area of values education--not just cognitive moral development which we've been discussing this morning, but also values clarification, values analysis, and establishing democratic communities. It seems to me that there are three really vital constituencies to think about, and that these constituencies focus around three issues. One is the issue of the school and the home, the second is the role of the general public in setting guidelines, and the third is moral education and the educational community. Let us analyze these three in turn.

We can start with the whole matter of the school and the home. People frequently say to me, "School should not deal with values issues because values issues are the province of the home, and of religious institutions, so let us stay out of this area!" They'll say further, "If you do teach values, whose values are to be taught, and how are you to teach them?" I think that this general charge is not a valid one because every school, whether it wants to or not, touches the issues of values. All of us who are involved in education recognize the force of this conclusion. The entire latent curriculum of a school emphasizes some kind of values. The way we teach can telegraph a message: "I as a teacher know everything," or "You're right or wrong, depending upon whether or not you agree with me." To a marked degree, lecturing implies a similar conclusion. It is

impossible to have a value-free educational institution. Hence, there are several vital questions to ask. Isn't it better to have our value goals explicit, rather than leave them implicit? How do we go about bringing congruence between the formal curriculum and the latent curriculum? Isn't it better that we think very carefully about congruency than leave the matter to chance? Civics classes send one message. You're all equal, you all have one vote, and you all participate in making policies that are your responsibility to carry out. Often the administrative structure says exactly the opposite: "Do as we tell you or we'll punish you, and you'll learn how wrong you are."

There is also a serious problem of how to avoid indoctrination. I do not want teachers indoctrinating my children with their value beliefs. If one teacher can do it, all teachers can. That conclusion implies that I must give a fascist or a fundamentalist the opportunity to indoctrinate my children. How do we avoid that sort of indoctrination in values programs?

It is also important to ask about the role of the general public in setting guidelines. The general public has strong opinions, but the general public often lacks technical information. At the same time, each constituency in the general public has a right to be involved in educational decisions. Their children are in the schools, and their children are being educated. They pay for the schools through taxes and tuition. Moreover, if we ignore the general public, they are going to cause a lot of trouble. In short, we must seek answers to two questions: How do we involve that general public in

setting guidelines? And,how can we anticipate the sorts of attacks that are likely to come from some elements of the general public? Those two issues seem to me of paramount importance.

The educational community has much more technical information than the general public. But values education is still a complicated issue. How do we as educators get involved in the decision making? We're in serious difficulty at one of the seven schools that the Carnegio-Mellon Education Center is involved with because the real decision making was made by the superintendent who failed to involve anybody else. The superintendent issued a mandate, "We are going to have an innovative civic education program and you teachers are going to cooperate willingly." That decision making process caused us nothing but trouble for the last couple of years. Administrators must always think carefully about who to involve in decision making and about how to involve them.

The workshop will deal with the problem of preparing practical programs. Most in-service work I know about is ineffective and a waste of school money. I refuse to go to one-day in-service sessions at which I'm asked to give a keynote address, because I think it's a waste of time. A speaker talks for an hour. Some people may leave somewhat interested in the subject. But what happens to the behavior of children in their classes as a result of this experience? In the 1960s, we interviewed eighth grade teachers who had attended a six weeks NDEA Institute on the New Deal. They reported that when they returned to their schools, they found the same old eight grade textbook on the shelves and they started the course with Columbus just as they

had before. Finally, they get around to the New Deal when the course was almost over. They quickly recognized the superficial treatment in the text. So they told the students everything that was wrong with the textbook version.

What's the effect of in-service work like that? The one-hour inspirational talk does nothing that changes student behavior. Nor does a six-week session directed at filling people's heads full of sophisticated knowledge about a subject such as the New Deal. We must become much more imaginative about what we're doing, and we have to start asking searching questions about how to organize in-service work. In our Civic Education Project in Pittsburgh, representatives of all the constituencies which are going to participate--including social studies teachers, English teachers, administrators, counselors, parents, and students--turn up for a fifteen-week staff development seminar that meets for two hours a week before we start a program in an attempt to get all educational constituencies involved.

You have all participated in two hours of a six-hour introduction to Cognitive Moral Development that Linda Rosenzweig, Lawrence Kohlberg and I have put together. We start the workshop with a moral discussion. We have a session on theory, followed by a second session on theory in which we try to get people to understand stages by sorting answers to a dilemma into Stages 1 through 5. This is followed by a sound filmstrip about how to lead a moral discussion. In the following session, participants are actively involved in trying to think about kinds of questions useful in moral discussions. Finally, there is a summary in which teachers who have been taking part in moral discussions describe

and analyze what they have learned in the sound filmstrip. I think that it is necessary to have that six hours as an introduction to moral discussions. At the end of those six hours, we expect some of the teachers who come to be able to lead satisfactory discussions of the three moral dilemmas used in the sessions, but we do not expect them to be able to develop their own materials or to know theory in a sophisticated way.

Educators must learn to think about what shape an effective in-service program takes. How does one follow up on a one-day workshop? If you get people in a one-day workshop and never see them again, nothing significant will happen. All of us must think about how to get teachers to attend, particularly in strongly unionized schools such as New York's.

> Should teachers be paid? Should they receive increment credit? Should periodic in-service work become part of a teacher's responsibilities under a union contract? Who should plan and run in-service programs?

Let us now examine the matter of evaluating and preparing materials. The market is absolutely flooded. I have prepared two pages listing sources from which you can secure materials for moral discussions. (See pages and .) It is impossible for a busy educator to read all material about values clarification published in the last decade. A lot of it is repetitious, but I find new books every couple of days. How does one determine what's good and what's not good? Some of that analysis is already taking place. For

example, the Social Science Education Consortium at Boulder, Colorado, puts out a data book in which they try to keep up to date on new curriculum materials. They carefully describe and review these materials and offer each of us an opportunity to secure this information through their publications. But analyzing published materials is still time consuming and difficult.

How are you going to get the materials prepared locally? I see nationally prepared materials, the kinds of sound filmstrips that Linda Rosenzweig, Lawrence Kohlberg and I have worked on, as transitional materials. They are designed to help people learn how to lead moral discussions. But teachers ought to be developing a lot of their own materials that fit into their own courses. To do it, I think they must first learn how to lead discussions with prepared topics and materials. Then, they should learn to develop their own materials, and that is a complicated and difficult task.

Materials should be developed for use within ongoing courses. Some schools have organized full courses or mini-courses in values clarification, values analysis, or cognitive moral development. I think that's a mistake. All of you know the history of fads in American education. Schools start a course in this, a course in that, depending on temporary societal pressures. In a few years, these courses disappear. So if we want to make a permanent impact, we cannot start new courses. Instead work within ongoing courses of study in both the elementary and secondary schools. It is important to start with the kinds of values analysis, values clarification, cognitive moral development exercises that fit within the content of

those courses, and contribute to learning in these courses in meaningful ways. That's a complicated issue. It's complicated because the cost of spending twelve class periods in moral discussions in an American history class is spending twelve fewer periods on the causes of the American Revolution, or the causes of the Civil War. A lot of content-oriented teachers don't want to make this change. They don't recognize why these alternative goals were so vital. So we have to work with teachers to help them develop sets of educational goals.

Our Civic Education Project in Pittsburgh has established five interrelated educational goals to which moral discussions can contribute. They are the development of basic participatory skills, such as reading, writing, speaking and listening; the development of basic intellectual skills, particularly the shift from concrete to formal operational thought on the Piagetian scale; personal development which stresses self-knowledge, self-esteem, and personal identity; knowledge of American political, economic and social institutions; and the development of the ability to understand democratic values. Let me indicate briefly how a moral discussion can contribute to the accomplishment of all five of these goals.

One of the moral dilemmas we use in the American history course asks whether John Adams should defend Captain Preston, the leader of the British soldiers at the time of the Boston massacre. The sound filmstrip on which the discussion is based presents arguments that Adams should and that he should not defend Captain Preston. The arguments are phrased at several stages of the Kohlberg scale. They are presented in the context of conversations which Adams has with his

law clerk and with Bostonians who are urging him to take one stand or another on the issue.

To take part in the discussion of this dilemma, students must have basic participatory skills, particularly viewing skills, speaking skills and listening skills. Each student must gather information from the sound filmstrip. Each one must be able to listen to arguments of other students in the class and to respond to them orally. A series of carefully conducted discussions of this sort should improve these three basic participatory skills.

The class usually divides about what Adams should do. The teacher then asks the students who think Adams should defend Captain Preston to state their first and second most important reasons for doing so. The other group states their first and second choices of reasons for not defending Preston. When a full class discussion begins, students rapidly present four or five different arguments on the issue. This discussion technique encourages students to identify a problem and to think carefully about a number of solutions to that problem. For that reason, it should contribute to the development of the techniques involved in formal operational thought.

Properly conducted moral discussions can lead to personal development. In the first place, they help students to define for themselves their position on some basic values issues. This sort of self-knowledge is a vital part of personal development. Properly conducted discussions can also enhance self-esteem. Discussion should focus on the arguments of students. Many students seldom hear their ideas discussed in class, and seldom receive reinforcement from

teachers for the things they say. Moral discussions can bring that reinforcement to students.

The sound filmstrip provides students with a substantial amount of information about colonial history. They learn the date of the Boston massacre; they learn details about what took place there; and they learn the names of the major protagonists. Most of all, they learn that famous Americans, such as John Adams, had to wrestle with fundamental values issues and to take action on the decisions they made. Our experience is that the information students gather from moral discussions based on real-life instances such as this one stays with them for a long time. They spend a full period discussing the dilemma in which Adams found himself as a result of the Captain Preston case. They are much less likely to forget details of the massacre than they would be if they had simply read about it in a paragraph or two in a textbook.

Finally, the discussion should lead to the ability to understand democratic values. Most of the high school students I teach think at Stage 2 or Stage 3 on the Kohlberg scale. A program of moral and civic discussions extending over several years should facilitate their development into Stage 4 thinkers. The Constitution and the Declaration of Independence are based on principles inherent in Stage 5. Unless students reach Stage 4 of the Kohlberg scale, they will not be able to comprehend these principles. For this reason, a program of moral discussions plays a vital role in a democratic school system.

We try to explain to teachers that moral discussions accomplish a number of goals. They are not simply an add-on which deprives teachers

of time to work toward traditional social studies goals. Instead they contribute substantially to the accomplishment of all of these goals. Explaining this situation to teachers gives them a new context in which to think about moral discussions. Values exercises fit within the goals of English teachers and social studies teachers. Once teachers recognize this conclusion, they are more likely to embrace these new techniques than they would otherwise be.

LUNCHEON SESSION

OPENING REMARKS

Rabbi Morris Sherer
Executive President
Agudath Israel of America

I am really delighted to chair a luncheon session of a group which is very unique, in that it brings together men and women of so many diverse backgrounds and groups. We are together today to discuss the moral and value crisis which afflicts the youth of our city, state and country. It is heartwarming that public and non-public school educators have decided to confront a difficult problem which for too long has been ignored.

Winston Churchill once said that problems do not go away if they are left alone. They gather steam until something explodes. So much of our contemporary society is populated by moral and ethical aimlessness; of young people plagued with emptiness. It is good therefore that school officials are at last turning to the question of how to develop value education. I hope that, by the end of the day, this conference will have helped us to find ways of conducting a program of the sort which will assist in developing well-balanced human beings.

We will begin with a fitting tribute to a man who played a key role in the first three conferences held under Dr. Lachman, a man for whom I had the highest respect, Msgr. James Feeney. To deliver this tribute, I will first call upon the Reverend Vincent Breen, who is the

Superintendent of Schools for the Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn and who succeeded Msgr. Feeney as Chairman of the Committee of Non-Public School Officials.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE

REV. MSGR. JAMES A. FEENEY

Reverend Vincent Breen
Superintendent of Schools
Roman Catholic Diocese of
Brooklyn
Chairman, Committee of
Non-Public School
Officials

For those of us here, and I know there are many of us who knew Msgr. James Feeney well, I think we would all recognize that Jim Feeney would be a little bit embarrassed by the next five or ten minutes of this program, and so what I have decided to do is relieve his embarrassment a bit, because we know that he is with us in spirit . . . and I'll say to him, "Jim, what we're here to do is to celebrate a few things. We're here to celebrate your life with us." Jim was not a pretentious man. He was not at all taken up by himself. I think he might even consider it somewhat comical if we try to be too serious today about him.

Since we're here to discuss value education, I thought that I might reflect upon three values that I remember and knew and cherished in Jim Feeney, and ask that we celebrate those three values in his life. Let us, therefore, celebrate together his friendship. To me he was a deep and real and true friend. I knew him for twelve years; we practically grew up together in Catholic education; he in the Archdiocesan office, and I in the Diocese of Brooklyn. He became Superintendent of Schools only six months before I took on the post in

the Diocese of Brooklyn. Through all that stretch of time, he was a true, real, deep, affectionate, loyal friend. He was a loyal friend because he always had time for his friends. He shared effortlessly with you his humor, his insights, his intense loyalty to the cause to which both of us were dedicated. You always relaxed when you were with Jim Feeney because you knew he was a friend, because you knew he cared deeply about his friends, and so let us celebrate in joy, together, today, his friendship.

The second value in Jim Feeney that I think we should celebrate today was his professionalism. Jim took his job seriously. He was intensely devoted to it; perhaps it is part of the reason why he was called so early to the Lord. He died as he had lived, dedicated to the work of education. He saw his work as an educator as a mission--a mission wherein he was called to prepare children to relate to men, to relate to the world, to relate to industry, to relate to culture, and to do so with a sense of awe and a sense of challenge. He never forgot the fact that as a professional educator, what we were most concerned about was children. We as professional educators can so often become involved in problems of administration and problems of curriculum, and all the variety of things that take up our time, and they took up his time . . . but he never lost sight of the fact that we must always come back to look to the children and to say, "Why is it that we are educators?" We are educators because we want to bring these children to have a sense of awe, a sense of wonderment, a sense of awareness of their own dignity and why they have received this dignity from the Lord.

And the last value that I think we should celebrate today in Jim Feeney's life was his dedication. I could speak of what I know . . . his dedication to his God and to his Church, but let us today speak more specifically about his dedication to education, his dedication to this conference. He was concerned about both public and non-public school education. He was proud of his concern for all school children. I'm sure that Chancellor Anker recalls that on many occasions, especially when he talked to him about the fact that we were all partners in education, that he saw a great pride in that fact, for his concern took in all children, whether they be in public schools or in non-public schools. His concern was always for what is for the good of the children, and it was to that that he was dedicated in his life. Perhaps it was also that dedication which led him to his early death.

Today, I think that Jim Feeney would simply want us to note these values in him, to rejoice in them. His life was all too short. Let us rejoice also in the blessing of the Lord, in giving him to us for even so short a time as He did.

Thank you.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE

REV. MSGR. JAMES A. FEENEY

Seymour P. Lachman
Professor of Education
Baruch College
Center for Advanced
Study in Education
Graduate School
University Center, CUNY

We were all saddened and schocked and somewhat diminished when we learned--this past September--of the passing of the Rev. Msgr. James Feeney. His loss has literally been felt by thousands of New Yorkers for our Jim Feeney was an extraordinarily noble and warm human being with an abundance of integrity. He was beloved by a multitude of people--Christians and Jews, blacks and whites, teachers and students, parents and community people, public and non-public school officials--all of whom came into contact with him during his lifetime.

I first met Msgr. Feeney almost a decade ago, shortly after I was appointed to the New York City Board of Education. Our friendship and respect for one another grew as we worked even more closely together--especially after he became Chairman of the Committee of Non-Public School Officials and I became President of the New York City Board of Education. We continued our friendship when I returned to academic life and organized with his great assistance these annual conferences on the Public and Non-Public Schools. Indeed, Jim Feeney was probably the most committed and involved participant in the four-year history of

this endeavor. To a very large extent, the success of each annual conference was due to him.

His loss--at an early age and at the prime of his life--has left a great void in education in New York City.

May the many bright and warm memories that each of us has of Jim Feeney serve as a means of easing the burdens of the present and inspiring the days and years of the future. Yes, may his life and life's work serve as an inspiration to all of us and may we all strive to improve and perfect education--both public and private--in his memory and in the cause of the children that we all serve.

LUNCHEON ADDRESS

Theodore M. Black
Chancellor
New York State Board of Regents

Honorable Theodore M. Black, Chancellor, New York State Board of Regents, spoke at the luncheon session and addressed the goals of value education. "Moral education," he stated, "can provide a vehicle through which both fair academic standards may be set and mistrust among groups can be overcome." Mr. Black also spoke of a position paper that the Board of Regents attempted to write but which was never produced for lack of agreement. Below is a portion of his remarks.

There is one area in which you, and the Regents, and all involved in education, can impart a certain respect for values, and that is in the setting of goals. After all, values are quite often defined in terms of the failure to reach goals, the establishment of standards of performance and the creation and proper use of the tools for the maintenance of those standards. Too often we adopt the slogan, "Fachite optimum potesse," which is my Latin translation of "Do the best you can," as the highest instruction we can give to young people. Or, "Do your own thing." Or, "Do what turns you on."

As far as I am concerned, we make a serious error with this approach because we're neither setting goals nor standards. What we should be telling young people is, "Do it right." There is a right answer to most questions. There is a right way to write an English sentence. There is a right way to spell.

I will tell you one story about my son. When he was in junior high school, he was a biology buff, and as a winter project, he

decided he would do a study of the effect of hexachlorophene on rats. During that winter we had six unwelcome house guests in the cellar, all part of the experiment. His final report began with the words, "I have been making an experiment in the effect of hexachlorophene on rats." And he spelled hexachlorophene perfectly. His problem was that he spelled making, m-a-k-e-i-n-g.

We must get back to insisting that they do it right, not passing it off and saying, "Well, that's pretty good." We have to establish the goals, and keep the tools--the examinations, the term papers, the sort of testing that will tell us whether an individual has really grasped the subject. I believe that if you tell a young person long enough and often enough, "Do it right," he may eventually get the idea that could also mean, "Do the right thing."

I think you're going to come out of this conference with some constructive ideas. I hope you succeed, and I wish you good luck, because it is a most important endeavor in which you are engaged.

I thank you very much for having me.

WORKSHOP ON DEVELOPING PRACTICAL PROGRAMS

IN VALUE EDUCATION

Prepared with the
assistance of
Donald Edward White

Co-Chairmen:

Ralph Brande, Superintendent, Community School Board 22
Joseph Preill, Pedagogic Specialist, Board of Jewish Education
of Greater New York

Ralph Brande

Introductory Statement:

We had hoped, and we do hope at this session to be able to work cooperatively with you. It can be a very profitable session for all of us because I think in New York City there has been no attempt made in the public schools, and apparently in the non-public schools, for a formal introduction of instruction in the area of moral and value education. Now, there are key words that cause flags to be waved. I think Ted [Edward] Fenton alluded to that this morning when he said he'd rather use "civics" than use "values" and "morals," because society has been conditioned these days to reacting almost negatively when they hear certain phrases.

There will be a meeting after this session breaks. The purpose of that will be to determine the implications for the future, or, "Where do we go from here?" Do we just drop it and say it's not worth the effort? Do we attack it at the grass roots? Do we feel that we're biting off more than we can chew at this point, that there

is a larger community outside of these walls that will object to this type of activity and, therefore, that we should back off? Do we agree with Admiral Farragut who said, "Damn the torpedoes, full speed ahead, and let's get something done"? Do we do it with proper preparation?

Joseph Preill

It seems to me it would be most useful for us to address ourselves to the questions that Ted Fenton charged us with right before lunch, and let's see whether we can address those questions.

The questions that I have are:

1. How to organize in-service work in terms of working for values education?
2. Who should be involved in in-service?
3. How long should it last?

I'm wondering if there's anyone in the room who would care to address any of those questions. Let's see if we can move from that point.

Brande

Ted, your direction seems to be aimed at the secondary school. Am I right in assuming that, or can this also be developed for elementary schools?

Edwin [Ted] Fenton

We've done a considerable amount of work with elementary schools, although my personal experience has been with secondary rather than elementary.

Can I tell you about some of my frustrations with in-service work? For the last four years, ASCD has sponsored clinics of one topic or another, and two to three of us turned up to do the clinics in cognitive moral development. One of us as an individual can't handle more than thirty people in a session like this. Three of us go and there are ninety participants there. Any good in-service worker requires an enormous amount of interaction, with people actually participating. We'll spend two days with ninety people and never hear from any of them again. My judgment is that it's pretty much a waste of time. People who go there say they've learned a great deal. They leave exhausted at the end of the first day, and they're drained on the second because they're working so hard; but then they go back as individuals to sixty different school systems and they have no one to talk to and no way to really get going.

It seems to me that society would be much better off if we do it differently. Let's not hold a ASCD conference in California where everybody would like to go because it's sunny. Let's do it in New York City. Let's say that nobody could come except people from New York City, and organize a two- or three-day session. Linda Rosenzweig, Larry Kohlberg and I have worked out a two-day session in which we introduce people to the techniques of leading moral discussions. At the end of a couple of days, and if the participants already have some skills in this area, they could then lead the discussions quite well. What I'd like to see a school system do is organize a couple of days like that with a follow-up two weeks later. Everybody who comes agrees to lead discussions in these two or three

dilemmas, and then to get together in subgroups or all together and talk about that experience.

You ought to also have three or four people from one school so that those people can watch each other. If someone really has a strong enouch ego, they can have that class video taped. Four teachers in school can look at that video tape and critique it together, as a learning device, then get back together and ask "what have we learned and what do we do next?" They should do that for three or four times, and then have sessions on how one writes moral dilemmas and how one integrates them into courses.

I think if we could plan a program like that and get it started and sustain it over a year, we can start to make some judgments about how valuable it is. The materials are out there. The talent's in the city. The interest is here in this room. But I think anything short of long-range planning and short of very careful following up will fail.

Brother James Kearney

I don't disagree with Dr. Fenton, but it seems to me that there is something even before that, that we really have to talk about. I think that if the process of planning you talked about went awry, it would take a long time for that kind of thing to ever come back to the school system. How do we even set a climate to make what you're talking about, practical? That's my dilemma. I think we have to discuss it as groups before we even talk about getting people to in-service programs. I think that the questions proposed are not as important. If there's going to be a logical flow, it seems to me

that question No. 2 (Who should be involved in in-service education programs?) should be the first question. And even before that, as an initial question, I think we should be asking ourselves, in our particular school, and our particular school system, or in our particular district, "What is this thing?"

I heard two talks in the morning, and I began to think that discussions relating to Moral Education were almost within the purview of the Social Studies Department. It wasn't until later in the morning that I was glad to hear Dr. Fenton say it belongs in other subject areas, too. So it seems to me that we're still not into really talking about a base from which all these things should flow. I see a lot of these discussions hopping around from one thing to another, without first relating it to a basic philosophy and then deciding what we really want to do.

Fenton

Lawrence Kohlberg's system focuses on how you think about civic problems and values problems. The system focuses on trying to get students to reason until they reach Stage 4 or Stage 5. At Stage 4, their reasoning focuses on societal maintenance. What do you have to do to keep society together? Why are there rules? Why should one obey rules? What happens to societies where people don't obey rules? What happens to all of us if you condone your friend ripping off a store? What happens to all of us if vandals break windows in buildings? Only when they get to Stage 4 can they start to understand the societal implications of individual actions.

I can't say to anyone, if you implement a program of civic education based partly on Lawrence Kohlberg's works, that vandalism in schools is going to go down. I have no evidence to support that argument at all. I think there are other ways to get at vandalism. One can argue, however, that there is much evidence that this kind of intervention has a number of good effects on the schools. It certainly helps us work on a lot of basic learning skills, reading, writing, speaking, things like that. It has a quite positive effect on the students' self-esteem and it can over a period of years, help to raise the level at which they think about these civic issues.

Yet it is somewhat complex and difficult to explain. It is not therefore surprising that many people today have experienced a desire to approach such programs in a careful and deliberate manner.

Lisa Kuhmerker

There's a dimension to involvement in moral development theory and practice that we are perhaps assuming, or are so much under the influence of that we haven't verbalized it. It is a tremendously exciting exploration because it comes at the crux of meaning making. This is not necessarily all a painful activity, but a very exciting one. If we can admit people to self select themselves for involvement in pilot stages, their excitement on getting a new window on the world will carry them through the agonies of practicing unfamiliar techniques.

Preill

Can we now challenge the powers behind this conference to come up with a program where sixty people would be invited to attend these

training sessions? I don't like the word training sessions, but sessions at any rate, two days one time, two days another time, a few weeks later. . . .

Fenton

Three weeks apart, five sessions.

Preill

Right. Participants would come from a wide variety of educational backgrounds, not only superintendents or principals, not only teachers or parents, but everybody. One dimension that I'd like to include is that these people would not come as isolated individuals from a school, but that they would have to come as a team. Four or five people will be talking to each other when you go away. And one of these people would have to be the principal of the school.

Brande

Aren't we now leaping ahead by two or three steps over where we may be moving in the immediate future? For example, it would seem to me that out of this particular meeting ought to come some volunteers from the various systems and groups represented here. The public schools, the diocesen Roman Catholic Brooklyn schools, the New York Roman Catholic archdiocesen schools, the Jewish day schools, the Lutheran schools, and others. Out of this group of public and non-public school systems ought to come some kind of statement addressed to the Board of Education, to the Superintendent of the Archdiocese, to the Secretary of Education, and so on, at each of the levels, to

see if we can't approach this in a unified fashion and get some kind of consensus at the overall city level as to "What are we talking about? What do we mean by words? How do we see this being approached? and so on.

Barbara Weldon

There is a policy of the central board established in 1955 which has never been rescinded to my knowledge, on the development of spiritual and moral values. It's in a booklet form. I think that we once even offered in-service courses in the school system in teaching Moral and Spiritual Values. There's a whole curriculum in teaching Moral and Spiritual Values, and as this gentleman said, teachers are teaching values.

Kearney

Dr. Weldon mentioned that there is an existing statement about possible commitment to moral and spiritual values. To me that's a platform. It's something concrete and at the risk of sounding preachy, the Catholic school system has that. We think we know where we're going. We think we know what we want to do in this area and we are quite proud of that. I think the process that was mentioned this morning is meaningful to us because it's another way of doing what we think we have to do better.

I think that the parochial school system is at a different level, in already having a concrete foundation from which to grow or, if you prefer, to implement some kind of program. For the first time I have heard that the public school system sometime in 1955 developed

something on which to work or build. But up until then I was saying, "Where do you start? Where do you people start?" That's why I raise the issue, and this, I think, is accounting for some of my past personal frustration in dealing with public and non-public school sectors in the realm of moral education.

William Caulfield

I'd like to say that I see something concrete developing here. There are already systems in our city that have statements of intent in this area. The Catholic schools have a statement, the non-Catholic schools, the Hebrew schools, and others, and the public schools. . . . Wouldn't it be appropriate to have a small group of people to assemble these statements, and see if we can come out with some consensus? I also would urge that we develop a structure to move ahead, to look for a grant, to set up an experiment.

Lynette Tucker

I would suggest that we start a pilot program, making sure that it is a concentrated effort, perhaps in one particular school, in order to better observe and analyze all forthcoming developments.

Brande

In closing this session, I think Joe Preill and I share the same feelings that this has been fruitful, much good has come of it, and we hope that we'll be able to realize one or two of these things with some small committees. Thank you very much.

CONCLUDING SESSION

Prepared with the
assistance of
Donald Edward White

Chairman:

Reverend Vincent Breen, Superintendent of Schools, Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn

Reverend Vincent Breen

Everyone of us has often had the experience of coming to a conference and looking upon it as a day we take out of our usual work schedule, and at the end of it we usually remember that it was "a very enjoyable experience. I wonder when the next conference is going to be. Oh, it's going to be next year at this time." And probably the next time it is thought about will be the following year.

One of the factors involved with what we have been talking about today is that we are not going to think about value education, next year at this time. We're not going to be involved in value education only one year from now. Tomorrow when all of us return to our various assignments, we will be involved, in some way, in the question of value education. What we've been thinking and talking about today may be in a more reflective fashion, how we're going to be living out our lives tomorrow and the day after. I think that when we come to the end of this conference and ask, "Where do we go from here?" we literally have to say to ourselves, "What was the meaning of the conference that we had today? What is the impact that it is going to have on us tomorrow? How do we individually and, far more important, how do we

collectively come to terms with what took place here today?

As a means of starting the discussion of the Concluding Session, I will ask that a leader from each of the afternoon workshops make a summary report of what took place in his or her group.

Evelyn Aquila

One of the questions that I think arose immediately in our session was the concern of some that religion was trying to come back into the public school system through value education. We tried to say that dialogue is very important with the parents and with the teachers as well. And one of the main things is explaining and realizing that a particular belief in a specific faith is very different from a universal, moral, value system that we can live with. We did come out with a few guidelines.

If we are going to introduce a curriculum for education into the school system, there must be an openness and a climate of dialogue within the community. And by community I mean the parents and the teachers in the school--so that they can work out a curriculum that adheres to the particular needs of the student. Also, they would want a clear definition in value education of the role of the parent and the teachers.

This morning we talked about how to guide the students to be able to make clear, rational decisions. Yet it's the gray areas that must be more carefully defined so that people can feel at ease with a program that is going to teach value education. It's also not appropriate to have a system that says to us that we're going to teach

value education, and yet when we put the teachers in the classroom they aren't quite sure what we're asking them to teach. There has to be intensive teacher training, plus open and continuing dialogue to bring the parents themselves into the process.

Brande

There were several important issues that were raised in our workshop session. First, there's a definite need for a definition and understanding of what we're really talking about, and the direction in which we're going to move. We certainly need a process of selectivity to determine who is going to pursue this, i.e., the teacher, the principals, the parents, the children, and so on.

This isn't something where we can say, "Everybody, starting tomorrow we're going to have value education." We've tried that before. Remember the phrases, "Starting next week, everybody's going into team teaching," or "Starting the week after next, we're going to have open classrooms." We have gone into various experiments without proper planning, implementation, and training, and they were therefore doomed to failure before we even had a chance to progress. We need a program which is properly planned over the next several years. I think Ted Fenton indicated to us that our efforts would be in vain before we get off the ground unless we think this through and develop a long-range program. But we just can't take one bit of it and drag it out to such a degree that everybody loses any feeling of getting things done and it dies because people just get bored with the whole thing. Perhaps we ought to have several things paralleling each other.

Ted Fenton pointed out to us that when we have training sessions, it is very important that we have several people from the same school building. It wouldn't do any good for us to have one teacher from each of the 32 school districts and one supervisor from each of the 32 school districts come in a particular training group. It would be better off it we concentrated on three, four schools throughout the city. These might be public, or non-public or all public, with perhaps ten people from a school, and not necessarily just professionals. One could also include parents, some students, and even some non-parent members of the community, such as paraprofessionals and other non-professionals who assist in the daily functioning of a school. They can get together between the sessions which would take place every three weeks or so, a concentration of two days, six to eight hours at a time, and be able to talk about the things they were doing and the things that they have learned.

I think the hidden agenda was the fear that some of the public schools had of involving themselves in the area of value education. Yet, we have numerous examples of successful experiments of public school systems with value education. The Scarsdale public school system has a Title 4c grant and is doing this. We know they're doing this up in Cambridge. They're also doing it in Brookline and they're doing it in Pittsburgh. So the public schools can get involved. Brother Kearney mentioned that the non-public schools have had for years an aim, a goal. Moral education has been one of the foundations of the Catholic schools' educational system. Community Superintendent Barbara Weldon pointed out to us that at about 1955, the then

Superintendent of Schools, William Jansen, and the Board of Education promulgated a policy on moral education, and since it's never been rescinded, it must still be the policy. Now all we have to do is find somebody who will say, "We will reissue the policy, and let's hope we can all do something about it."

I think what we're going to come down to is possibly a suggestion that out of this session, there be formed a committee of people representing each of the groups that were here today, a committee which would pull together all of those statements we had from public education; those statements that we have from the Jewish day schools, and the Catholic schools, and the Lutheran schools, and wherever else. They could then be brought together in a policy statement that might come out of this committee, and lead in the direction that we as a group would want these school systems to move.

Fenton

The State of Illinois, under its Superintendent of Instruction, Dr. Joseph Cronin, started a program called Responsibility Education. He's talking about the 4 r's which he calls reading, writing, arithmetic, and responsibility. That strikes me as a stroke of total genius because if you start to say moral education, it's going to cause an immediate misunderstanding. Civic education is tired. Everybody hated civics, for good reason. Ethical education frightened some other people. I don't know anybody who's really frightened by responsibility. Talking about the 4 r's involves us in the "back to basics" movement. Yet, much of the "back to basics"

movement isn't basic at all. It's an attempt to have the students learn the facts of American history and not how to deal intellectually with a lot of problems, which are far more basic considerations. I would therefore throw out to you the thought that some good ideas do come from the West, and this one from the State of Illinois might be worthy of your consideration.

Preill

There seem to be two thoughts on the floor now. One is the question of the position paper and the other is the proposal to have a series of workshops for about sixty people involved in the education of our children. But what are the practicalities and problems of moving in both these areas?

A position paper does not seem to require any funding; you just have to assemble the people who are going to agree with each other and then publish. To have about sixty people from, perhaps, six schools participate in internal workshops would seem to require some, though not major, funding. But is this practical, or is it just a pipe dream? Do we actually know if there might be some funding available?

Breen

Let me raise the question of the first proposal that is before us, of a group coming together and attempting to publish a position paper. Let me raise a few questions as to why and who and in what form is it intended to be disseminated, and what is it basically intended to do?

Fenton

I hear you talking about citizenship education. Unless I'm seriously in error, there's going to be a great deal of money in citizenship education from the federal government in the near future. It seems to me what you people might do here is get together a city-wide group that can have a look at values education, and that can look at different plans for values education in relationship to citizenship education. It can also attempt to start some pilot projects, so that when the federal money becomes available, you're ready to ask for that money from the government with some experience behind you. After putting together a short paper, ten to twenty pages, written in simple language that newspapers can pick up, you ought to be able to get on talk shows. Try to think of a public campaign that really touches this city. You will need short statements put together by responsible people with an idea to understanding what you're trying to do. Initially, however, generating money for pilot projects seems to me a really practical way to start.

Breen

This is a suggestion that there be an authorization from this group for the establishment of a planning committee that is going to develop the parameters of what we have been talking about, with a brief rationale for ourselves and a program plan as to what direction we're going to move, as well as how we're going to move in it.

Preill

Whom do you see as responsible for directing this? I think that person becomes the critical party.

Breen

It seems to me that if we look at it, it can go one of two ways. The chairperson could literally be Dr. Lachman, or the chairperson could be anyone from here who was elected. To whom would that person have to respond? I think back to Dr. Lachman and through Dr. Lachman, to the people who were invited to this particular conference.

Sister Betty Ann McKiernan

Perhaps the position paper should be worked on by a particular group, and then be sent out to all of the constituencies involved in the public and non-public school sectors, soliciting interested representation to work on a large task force. Perhaps the representation that comes could be broken up into the three components of people to work on values education, how to develop workshops for teachers, and how to organize the parents.

Breen

Are you talking about a preliminary committee that would not involve parents or teachers but would come directly from these people who are present at this workshop?

McKiernan

Right.

Breen

But their approach would be then something that would lead them to reach out toward parents, teachers and other community groups that should be involved in this process.

McKiernan

Right. I think that might divide up the tasks. It would involve the whole community, and it might have greater impact when it came time for implementation.

Breen

The question before us is two concomitant committees to work on the rationale and a process to draw together some plan of action.

[The above was put to a vote and passed as a motion.]

Breen

I think we've agreed that what we're talking about is responsibility rather than value education or moral education, and that we will recommend the creation of two committees which will ultimately be appointed by the Chairman of the Conference and responsible to the Chairman. They could work concomitantly: one on drawing up a rationale, the other on drawing up a process for planning for future steps that would be taken in a practical order.

Linda Rosenzweig

I've enjoyed the day very much. The way you've put together this "What shall we do next?" session has been masterful. My

compliments to the Chairperson and to all those who helped to put this together. I think it's exciting and interesting, and I hope you will ask us to come again in some capacity. I think that after you get together and decide what you would like to do, there is much to which we can make input. I think we'd love to be involved further in helping you bring responsibility back to the Big Apple.

Breen

Thank you all for a very enjoyable day.

APPENDIX A

ROSTER OF CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Hon. Stephen R. Aiello
President
NYC Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Irving Anker
Chancellor
NYC Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Evelyn Aquila
Human Life Coordinator
Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn
345 Adams Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Frank C. Arricale, II
Executive Director
Division of Personnel
NYC Board of Education
65 Court Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Rev. Terence Attridge
Associate Superintendent
Archdiocese of New York
1011 First Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Rev. Howard J. Basler
Assistant Director, C.C.D.
Diocese of Brooklyn
345 Adams Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Lillian Bass
Assistant to the Chancellor
NYC Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Marilyn Birnbaum
President
Community School Board 20
7101 Shore Road
Brooklyn, New Yolk 11209

Hon. Theodore M. Black
Chancellor
New York State Board of Regents
1075 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576

Rabbi Shmuel Bloom
Agudath Israel of America
5 Beekman Street
New York, New York 10038

Dr. Richard M. Bossone
Professor of English
Graduate School & University
Center/CUNY
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Rev. James Bradley, S.J.
Fordham University
Lincoln Center
New York, New York 10023

Dr. Ralph Brande
Community Superintendent
District 22
NYC Board of Education
2525 Haring Street
Brooklyn, New York 11235

Rev. Vincent Breen
Superintendent of Schools
Diocese of Brooklyn
345 Adams Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dr. Benjamin Brickman
Board of Jewish Education of
Greater New York
426 West 58th Street
New York, New York 10019

Rabbi Seymour Brickman
Board of Jewish Education of
Greater New York
426 West 58th Street
New York, New York 10019

Murray Bromberg
President
High School Principals'
Association
Andrew Jackson High School
207-01 116th Avenue
Cambria Heights, New York 11411

Dr. Gerald Brooks
Administrator
Division of Personnel
NYC Board of Education
65 Court Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Rev. Joseph P. Bynon
Vicar
Diocese of Brooklyn
P.O. Box C
Brocklyn, New York 11202

Eileen Byrne
Community School Board 22
NYC Board of Education
2525 Haring Street
Brooklyn, New York 11235

Helen Carey
President
Manhattan Federation
Parents' Association
707 Henry Street
Brooklyn, New York 11231

William Caulfield
President
Community School Board 26
NYC Board of Education
56-49 215th Street
Bayside, New York 11364

Dolores Chitraro
Diocese of Brooklyn
345 Adams Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Bro. James Corcoran, F.S.C.
Archdiocese of New York
1011 First Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Dr. Michael J. Costelloe
Special Assistant to the
Chancellor
NYC Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Jean L. DaProcida
President
Queens Federation of High School
Parents' Associations
34-52 75th Street
Jackson Heights, New York 11372

Charlotte Dizard
Chairperson
Staten Island Federation of PTAs
High School Committee
48 Boulevard
Staten Island, New York 10314

Sister Joanne Drinane, C.N.D.
St. Jean Baptiste High School
173 East 75th Street
New York, New York 10021

Dr. Lorna Edmonson
Educational Coordinator
Citizens' Committee for
Children of New York, Inc.
2 Park Avenue
New York, New York

Dr. Richard Engebrecht
Staff Executive for
Education Services
Atlantic District
Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod

Edward Espaillat
Special Representative
United Federation of Teachers
260 Park Avenue
New York, New York

Dr. Edwin Fenton
Director
Education Center
Carnegie-Mellon University
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Peggy Frary
Community School Board 27
87-51 114th Street
Richmond Hill, New York 11364

Dr. Helen M. Fuelner
Executive Director
Division of Special Education and
Pupil Personnel Services
NYC Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Sister Angela Gannon, C.S.J., M.A.
Administrative Assistant
Religion Department
Diocese of Brooklyn
345 Adams Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Harvey Garner
Community Superintendent
District 18
NYC Board of Education
755 East 100th Street
Brooklyn, New York 11236

Dr. Philip Groisser
Superintendent
Brooklyn High Schools
NYC Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Murray Hart
Assistant to the Chancellor
NYC Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dr. Tom Heath
Administrator
Office of Inter-Cultural
Relations and Non-Public
School Services
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12234

Sister Frances Heerey, S.C.
Associate Superintendent
Archdiocese of New York
1011 First Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Sister Laura Helbig, O.P.
Vicariate Coordinator
Diocese of Brooklyn
345 Adams Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dr. Hans J. Hillerbrand
Provost
Graduate School & University
Center/CUNY
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York

Ponsie Hillman
Assistant Treasurer
United Federation of Teachers
260 Park Avenue South
New York, New York

Dr. Benjamin Israel
Professor of Education
Baruch College
17 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York

Hon. Harold M. Jacobs
Chairman
Board of Higher Education
City of New York
535 East 80th Street
New York, New York 10021

Philip Kaplan
President
NYC School Board Association
Community School Board 15
NYC Board of Education
c/o Levy, Guttman, Goldberg & Kaplan
363 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10001

Bro. James Kearney, F.M.S.
Superintendent of Schools
Archdiocese of New York
1011 First Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Joan Kenny
Community Superintendent
District 25
NYC Board of Education
P.S. 200
70-30 164th Street
Queens, New York 11365

Ann Kessler
Brooklyn Borough Representative
United Federation of Teachers
260 Park Avenue South
New York, New York

Dr. Robert Kibbee
Chancellor
The City University of New York
535 East 80th Street
New York, New York 10021

Frances Klotz
Chairperson
Brooklyn Federation of High School
Parents' Associations
949 East 80th Street
Brooklyn, New York 11236

Professor Lisa Kuhmerker
Director
Center of Lifelong Learning
Hunter College
695 Park Avenue
New York, New York

Dr. Seymour P. Lachman
Professor of Education
Baruch College
Center for Advanced Study
in Education
Graduate School & University
Center/CUNY
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Pamela Levin
Vice President
Citizens' Committee for Children
of New York, Inc.
2 Park Avenue
New York, New York

Felton Lewis
President
Association of Assistant &
Community School
Superintendents
District 12
708 East Tremont Avenue
Bronx, New York 10457

Rabbi Menachem Lubinsky
Agudath Israel of America
5 Beekman Street
New York, New York 10038

Sister Filippa Luciano, C.S.J.
Vicariate Coordinator
Diocese of Brooklyn
345 Adams Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dr. Frank Macchiarola
Vice President for
Institutional Advancement
Graduate School & University
Center/CUNY
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Sister Alice McCaffrey, O.P.
Dominican Academy
44 East 68th Street
New York, New York 10011

Dr. Neil McCluskey
Director
Center for Gerentological Studies
Center for Advanced Study in Education
Graduate School & University Center/CUNY
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Sister Betty Ann McKiernan, C.I.J.
Archdiocese of New York
1011 First Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Alfred Melov
Community Superintendent
District 15
NYC Board of Education
360 Smith Street
Brooklyn, New York 11231

Julian J. Misiurski, Jr.
President
Community School District 8
Board of Education
3294 Agar Place
Bronx, New York 10465

Sister Patricia Monahan, C.S.J.
Vicariate Coordinator
Diocese of Brooklyn
345 Adams Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Sister Rita Nowatzki, S.C.
Archdiocese of New York
1011 First Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Sister Anna O'Connell, R.S.M.
Vicariate Coordinator
Diocese of Brooklyn
345 Adams Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Rev. James O'Donnell, S.J.
Xavier High School
30 West 16th Street
New York, New York 10011

Samuel Polatnick
Executive Director
High School Division
NYC Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Prof. Irwin Polishook
President
Professional Staff Congress
AFL-CIO
211 East 43rd Street
New York, New York 10017

Carol Poteat
High School Division
NYC Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dr. Joseph Preill
Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York
426 West 58th Street
New York, New York 10019

Harold M. Proshansky
President
Graduate School & University Center/CUNY
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Msgr. Donald Pryor
Secretary for Education
Archdiocese of New York
1011 First Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Dr. Benjamin Rivlin
Dean
Research & University Programs
Graduate School & University Center/CUNY
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Linda Rosenzweig
Senior Research Assistant
Carnegie-Mellon University
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Rose Rubin
President
Bronx Federation of High School
Parents' Associations
1165 Rhinelander Avenue
Bronx, New York 10461

Dr. Alvin I. Schiff
Executive Director
Board of Jewish Education of
Greater New York
426 West 58th Street
New York, New York 10019

Dr. Joel Segall
President
Bernard M. Baruch College
17 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10010

Dr. Benjamin Sharfman
2117 79th Street
Brooklyn, New York

Nanette Shaw
Director
Publications & Community Relations
Graduate School & University
Center/CUNY
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Menachem Shayovich
Special Assistant to the Governor
Executive Chambers
1350 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10019

Rabbi Morris Sherer
Executive President
Agudath Israel of America
5 Beekman Street - Suite 910
New York, New York 10038

Rabbi Melvin Sirner
Beth El Synagogue
New Rochelle, New York

Dr. Solomon Skaist
Board of Jewish Education
of Greater New York
426 West 58th Street
New York, New York 10019

Sister Patricia Strozak, C.S.J.
Vicariate Coordinator
Diocese of Brooklyn
345 Adams Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Mary Treacy
Community School Board 15
360 Smith Street
Brooklyn, New York 11231

Lynette Tucker
Assistant Administrative Director
Division of Personnel
NYC Board of Education
65 Court Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dr. Max Weiner
Director
Center for Advanced Study
in Education
City University of New York
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Marvin Weingart
Community Superintendent
District 26
NYC Board of Education
P.S. 179
196-25 Peck Avenue
Flushing, New York 11365

Barbara M. Weldon
Community Superintendent
District 2
NYC Board of Education
P.S. 116
210 East 33rd Street
New York, New York 10016

Donald Edward White
Graduate Student & Assistant
to the Chairman
Graduate School & University
Center/CUNY
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

Charles Wilson
Assistant Administrative Director
Community School District 2
NYC Board of Education
P.S. 116
210 East 33rd Street
New York, New York 10016

Priscilla Wooten
Office of the President
NYC Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Jean Bleckner
Gloria Gembale
Kathy Kenyon
Elaine Murphy
Evelyn Port

APPENDIX B

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

9:00 a.m. - 12 noon	Morning Session Co-Chairpersons: Msgr. Donald Pryor, Secretary for Education, Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York Dr. Alvin Schiff, Executive Vice-President Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York
9:00 - 9:30 a.m.	Four Approaches to Value Education Dr. Edwin Fenton, Director, Carnegie-Mellon Education Center, Pittsburgh
9:45 - 10:30 a.m.	Taking Part in a Value Discussion: A Participatory Demonstration Dr. Edwin Fenton and Ms. Linda Rosenzweig, Senior Research Associate, Carnegie-Mellon Education Center
10:45 - 11:30 a.m.	Cognitive Moral Development: The Theory & Reaction-Presentation of Sound Film Strip and General Discussion Ms. Linda Rosenzweig
11:30 a.m. - 12 noon	Value Education in the Schools: The Key Issues Dr. Edwin Fenton
12 noon - 1:45 p.m.	Luncheon Session Chairman: Rabbi Morris Sherer, Executive President, Agudath Israel of America

Tribute to the late Rev. Msgr. James A. Feeney

Rev. Vincent Breen, Superintendent of Schools, Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn; Chairman, Committee of Non-Public School Officials
Dr. Seymour P. Lachman

Greetings

The Honorable Steven P. Aiello, President, Board of Education
The Honorable Harold M. Jacobs, Chairman, Board of Higher Education
Dr. Harold M. Proshansky, President, Graduate School and University Center, CUNY
Dr. Joel Segall, President, Bernard M. Baruch College, CUNY

Guest Speaker:

The Honorable Theodore M. Black, Chancellor, New York State Board of Regents

1:45 - 3:30 p.m. Afternoon Session

Workshop A: The Affected Constituencies

School and Home
Role of General Public in Setting Guidelines
Value Education and the Educational Community

Co-Chairpersons:

Mrs. Evelyn Aquila, Human Life Coordinator, Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn and former Chairperson, Community School Board 21
Mr. Philip Kaplan, President, New York City School Boards Association and Chairman, Community School Board 15

Workshop B: Preparing Practical Programs

In-Service Work for Teachers
Evaluation and Preparing Materials
Fitting Value Education into Traditional Disciplines

Co-Chairpersons:

Dr. Ralph Brande, Superintendent, Community School Board 22
Dr. Joseph Preill, Pedagogic Specialist, Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York

3:30 - 5:00 p.m. Concluding Session

Implications for the Future: Where Do We Go From Here?

Co-Chairpersons:

Dr. Seymour P. Lachman
Rev. Vincent Breen

Appendix C

CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Dr. Seymour P. Lachman, Chairman, Professor of Education, Baruch College, and Center for Advanced Study in Education, Graduate Center and University Center, CUNY

Rev. Howard Basler, Assistant Director, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn

Ms. Leotta Boulware, Special Assistant to the President, New York City Board of Education

Dr. Ralph Brande, Superintendent, Community School Board 22

Rev. Vincent Breen, Superintendent of Schools, Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn; Chairman, Committee of Non-Public School Officials

Rabbi Murray Friedman, Program Director of Counterforce (Mental Health and Guidance), National Hebrew Day School Movement

Dr. Bernard Fryshman Chairman, Commission on Legislation and Civic Action, Agudath Israel of America

Dr. Jerrold Glassman, Deputy Superintendent, Community School Board 15

Brother James Kearney, Superintendent of Schools, Roman Catholic Archdiocese of New York

Rev. Robert Kennedy, Director, Social Action, Catholic Charities, Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn

Dr. Lisa Kuhmerker, Director, Center for Lifelong Learning, Hunter College; Editor, Moral Education Forum

Dr. Bartelo Peluso, Superintendent, Community School Board 21

Dr. Joseph Preill, Pedagogic Specialist, Board of Jewish Education of Greater New York

Dr. Benjamin Sharfman, Staff Psychologist and Coordinator of Services, Interborough Developmental & Consultation Center

66

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SOURCES FOR MORAL DILEMMAS

Prepared by
Edwin Fenton

Blatt, Moshe, Ann Colby and Betsy Speicher. Hypothetical Dilemmas for Use in Classroom Moral Discussions. Cambridge: Harvard University Moral Education Research Foundation, 1974. This volume includes a wide variety of dilemmas developed for schools, colleges, and classes in sex education. Some of the dilemmas, originally written for other audiences, can be adapted to use in secondary schools. There are no lesson plans and no suggestions for leading moral discussions in this publication.

Fenton, Edwin (ed.). The Carnegie-Mellon Social Studies Curriculum. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973-1975. The second edition of this series of social studies textbooks and audio-visual materials includes moral dilemmas as an integral part of each individual course. The dilemmas appear on ditto masters in the AV kit. Facsimiles of the dilemmas, suggestions for leading moral discussions, and lesson plans all appear in the Teacher's Guide to the following courses in the sequence: Comparative Political Systems, Comparative Economic Systems, The Shaping of Western Society, Tradition and Change in Four Societies, and A New History of the United States.

Fenton, Edwin and Lawrence Kohlberg. Teacher Training in Values Education: A Workshop. New York: Guidance Associates, 1976. This kit presents a basic introduction to Kohlberg's work and its implications for the classroom. It is designed for use as an individual self-instructional kit or for use by a workshop leader as the basis for a six-hour teacher preparation workshop. The kit includes four sound filmstrips, a series of worksheets on duplicating masters for use by teachers or workshop participants, and specific plans for utilizing these materials for self-instruction or for conducting a workshop.

Fenton, Edwin and Lawrence Kohlberg. Universal Values in American History. New York: Guidance Associates, 1976. This series consists of twenty moral dilemmas designed for use in junior or senior high school American history courses. Each of the five units focuses on a different chronological period in American history. Each unit contains two dilemmas on sound filmstrips and two on duplicating masters. The Teacher's Guide summarizes the theoretical rationale, suggests appropriate discussion techniques, and contains specific lesson plans for each dilemma.

67

Fenton, Edwin and Lawrence Kohlberg. Values in a Democracy. New York: Guidance Associates, 1976. This series contains twenty moral dilemmas designed for use in Civics or Problems of Democracy courses. Each of the five units contains two dilemmas on sound filmstrips and two on duplicating masters. The Teacher's Guide summarizes the theoretical rationale, provides background information for the filmstrip dilemmas, suggests appropriate discussion techniques, and contains specific lesson plans for each dilemma.

Galbraith, Ronald E. and Thomas M. Jones. Moral Reasoning: A Teaching Handbook for Adapting Kohlberg to the Classroom. Anoka, Minn.: Greenhaven Press, 1976. This volume introduces teachers to tested techniques for leading moral discussions and contains a number of moral dilemmas.

Selman, Robert and Lawrence Kohlberg. Relationships and Values. New York: Guidance Associates, 1976. This series consists of ten sound filmstrips, dealing with interpersonal relationships and moral judgment, designed for use with junior and senior high school students. Each of the five units contains one filmstrip that stresses interpersonal relationships and one filmstrip that stresses moral judgment. The Teacher's Guide contains a rationale and lesson plans for each filmstrip.

Selman, Robert and Lawrence Kohlberg. First Things: Social Reasoning. Elementary sound filmstrips. New York: Guidance Associates, 1975. This is an excellent series of eight sound filmstrips designed to help elementary grade children develop and use the ability to reason about moral situations involving social interactions. The series includes two sound filmstrips as teacher training materials.

Selman, Robert and Lawrence Kohlberg. First Things: Values. Sound filmstrips for primary years. New York: Guidance Associates, 1972. This excellent series of twelve sound filmstrips focuses on moral topics of importance to primary grade children. A teacher training component is included.

Recent Collections of Articles About Cognitive Moral Development

Lickona, Thomas (ed.). Moral Development and Behavior: Research, Theory, and Social Issues. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1976. (Excellent bibliography)

Meyer, John R. (ed.). Reflections on Values Education. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier Press, 1976.

Meyer, John R. (ed.). Values Education: Theory/Practice/Problems/ Prospects. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier Press, 1975.

Purpel, David and Kevin Ryan (eds.). Moral Education . . . It Comes With the Territory. Berkeley: McCutcheon Publishing Corporation, 1976.

Scharf, Peter (ed.). Readings in Moral Education. Minneapolis: The Winston Press, Inc., 1978.

Issues of Journals

The Phi Delta Kappan, 56, 6 (June, 1975).

Social Education, 40, 4 (April, 1976); 41, 1 (January, 1977).

Theory Into Practice, 16, 2 (April, 1977).

Journals

The Journal of Moral Education. Humanitas Press; Wexford Avenue; Needham Heights, Mass., 02194. ($24 annually for three issues)

Moral Education Forum. Lisa Kuhmerker (ed.); 221 East 72nd Street; New York, New York 10021. ($5 annually for five issues. Publishes excellent annual bibliographies.)

Dissemination Center

Thomas Ladenberg, Coordinator; Brookline Dissemination Center; Brookline High School; 115 Greenough Street; Brookline, Mass. 02146. (classroom materials)

Consulting and Workshops

Moral Education Consulting Service; 223 Porter Hall; Carnegie-Mellon University; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213.